

Date: Sun, 22 May 94 04:30:17 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #217
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Sun, 22 May 94 Volume 94 : Issue 217

Today's Topics:

 Code test speeds
 FCC understaffing problem (2 msgs)
 Theory Exams.
 What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 19 May 1994 19:01:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
usernet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Code test speeds
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

md@maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu (Michael P. Deignan) writes:

>dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:
>
>> [Fairly intelegent and fairly well expressed MD comments deleted]
>
>Gee Dan, a compliment. Next thing you know you'll be agreeing with me! :-)

Fasten your seat belts Michael.

>> You continue to miss the point, it is NOT that it is "too hard" it is that
>> it is NOT RELEVANT. To require effort, just for efforts sake is hazing.
>> Either admit it and quit the argueing or listen to the comments. Very few

>> have opposed the code because it is "too hard".

>

>Its always been my understanding, from even 10 years ago when my father-in-law and brothers-in-law wanted me to get involved in the hobby that the >two aspects of the examinations were designed to test your ability to grasp >theory, and test your operating abilities in one particular mode. The concept >being that there is "theory", but there is also "in practice".

But that mode WAS relevent to the purposes AT THAT TIME. The ONE mode needed for a 'pool of trained radio operators'. This is no longer the case (except for ship board operations, i.e. cost to ship owners).

>Now, I'll agree with you that the code test is not relevent to those people >who simply wish to work SSB on HF. But, what do we replace it with? A SSB >operating test? But then people would complain that THAT test isn't >relevent, or that its "outdated", since SSB is as almost as old as CW.

Yes, no single mode is required to be a 'good amateur'. If there was such a mode I would agree to a test of it.

>I've stated before that I'm all for reducing the code requirements for HF, >but only if we can insure that people coming into the hobby have a good >grasp of theory and operation. But, even that doesn't appear good enough >for some people, who apparently think that amateur licenses should simply >be given away with simpleton questions, or even no examination at all - that >the license is somehow an "entrance" level license, and thus we should >excuse all stupidity or learning for the sake of getting people into the >hobby. Again, quantity rather than quality.

If we are to have 5 (maybe 6) license classes (UGH!) then what is wrong with a limited entrance exam?

>When I feel more comfortable that the theory examinations meet the >expectation I outlined above, then I will support code reductions or >eliminations. However, I doubt its ever going to happen. The "dumbing down" >of the theory is only the logical progression in the hobby, since trends >in the hobby reflect trends in american society as a whole.

Maybe we need to work together to beef up the pools. THEN reduce the the code requirements (note I said REDUCE!).

>I anticipate that within 10 years the code requirements will be completely >eliminated, and most of the theory examinations, if not eliminated as well, >will be so easy that a monkey with a crayon could pass the exam.

I hope we can work together to prevent this.

> If you

>examine happenings in amateur radio, you will see that this is not too far
>from the mark - first, forces worked to get the code requirement eliminated
>for an "entry level" license; they are now working on eliminating the
>requirement altogether; and, at the same time, the theory exams get dumbed
>down - for instance, the Novice pool was rewritten for what? A 6th grade
>reading level?

Then lets change it.

>All I have to do is look back those ten years when I first started to get
>involved in the hobby. My father-in-law, who has been licensed almost
>twice as long as I've been alive (and no, he doesn't ride around in a
>geeze-mobile) introduced me to some of his ham friends in the area who
>were into computer/ham stuff (i.e. packet, rtty with a computer, etc.)
>These guys were "Extras"... Not the "Instant Extras" we have today, but
>Real Hams[tm] who really knew their stuff. These guys were huge vats of
>knowledge you could ask anything and get an answer, and they didn't mind
>sitting down with you and explaining it in detail. Maybe they did CW,
>maybe they didn't. I don't know nor do I care.

>

>Today, however, I hear "Instant Extras" on the radio talking (incorrectly)
>about how to make a dipole. The usual conclusion to the conversation is
>"I'm gonna call HRO fer sure."

I could not agree more! (Do you need 911 now Michael?)

>Then I look at the licensing system, and say to myself: "this is what its
>given us." Great.

But we, as amateurs are responsible for that. Lets work together to
correct it an FIX what is so obviously broken.

>MD

>--

>-- Michael P. Deignan

>-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101

>-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest
reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is
as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

Date: 21 May 94 20:17:00 GMT

From: agate!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!netline-fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!nntp-server.caltech.edu!news.claremont.edu!kaiwan.com!ledge!
darryl.linkow@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: FCC understaffing problem
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello all! I have now been waiting for 7 weeks for my first license to arrive in the mail. Having read all the horror stories on the nets regarding waiting times, I decided to call the FCC in Gettysburg and find out what the REAL problem is myself. I spoke to a very nice woman who told me that it is now taking from 12 to 14 weeks to process application forms because there is only ONE PERSON keying in the information to the computer. Also, she said that the "new computer" that people have talked about on the nets is not online yet. (Hmm...it only took me a couple of hours to set up my latest 486 box!). At any rate, this ONE PERSON evidently has thousands of licenses to process. The woman told me that she had not heard of any offers from the ARRL regarding local volunteers in the Gettysburg area coming in to help out with the backlog and enter data into the computer. I told her that since we have volunteers doing license testing, at no charge to the Federal government via the VEC program, it seems that we could have volunteer personnel to perform data entry! She also told me that the Gettysburg office has requested additional help several times from the Managing Director of the FCC in Washington, D.C., but the man refuses to give them any more employees, for even a short period of time, to clear up the backlog of license applications. I have called my local Congressman, Representative Anthony Beilenson, and told one of his staff about the problem. I asked if the Congressman could contact the Managing Director and ask for some additional staffing in Gettysburg, at least on a temporary basis, to get the backlog of amateur radio applications (Form 610) processed. Perhaps if everyone told their respective Congressman about the problem, we could get some help! Here is the name, address, and phone number of the FCC Managing Director who will not let Gettysburg have any additional people to help get rid of the backlog:

Andrew Fishel
Managing Director
FCC
1919 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC
(202) 632-6390

Just as an aside, I decided to get my amateur license because of the problems associated with the January 17 earthquake here. The American Red Cross had a severe shortage of qualified amateur radio operators to handle emergency traffic after the earthquake. So, I decided, as a citizen of the community, that I would get my

license, so that I might get involved in disaster communications, and be ready to assist, if needed. But, as of right now, I can not participate in any emergency networks until my license arrives!!

Also, I am routing a copy of the above information to President Clinton and Vice President Gore. I understand that Vice President Gore is very interested in information processing and bottlenecks in those areas of the government that are having problems processing data.

I am open to discussing this with anyone on the net, but if you want to work for the improvement of this problem, please call or write to Mr. Fishel and your elected federal government officials in Congress and The White House.

Sincerely,

Darryl Linkow (no callsign after 7 weeks and don't expect to see one for another 5 to 7 weeks!)

~ OLX 2.2 ~ Darryl Linkow (818)346-5278 9 am - 5 pm PDT

Date: 21 May 94 22:48:01 GMT

From: agate!library.ucla.edu!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ccnet.com!ccnet.com!not-for-mail@ucbvax.berkeley.edu

Subject: FCC understaffing problem

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Darryl Linkow (darryl.linkow@ledge.com) wrote:

: Just as an aside, I decided to get my amateur license because of
: the problems associated with the January 17 earthquake here. The
: American Red Cross had a severe shortage of qualified amateur radio
: operators to handle emergency traffic after the earthquake. So, I
: decided, as a citizen of the community, that I would get my
: license, so that I might get involved in disaster communications,
: and be ready to assist, if needed. But, as of right now, I can not
: participate in any emergency networks until my license arrives!!

I would hope that while you are waiting for your licence to arrive you are participating in all the weeks of training necessary to be a fully qualified disaster service worker. There is no shortage of licenced amateur operators in Southern California. Hopefully you will join a group that can provide you the training and the resources required. The ARES or RACES programs are always willing to take on committed amateurs such as yourself.

The Amateur radio service licence has always taken about ten weeks, even in the sixties when I started. Broadcast applications can take a year or more. Amateur Radio should never be thought of as instant gratification. Most of us have taken years to achieve our goals.

What you should be asking is - why does the Red Cross still have a severe shortage of qualified amateur radio disaster service workers in your area?

Bob

--

Bob Wilkins	work	bwilkins@cave.org
Berkeley, California	home	rwilkins@ccnet.com
94701-0710	play	n6fri@n6eeg.#nocal.ca.usa.noam

Date: Sat, 21 May 1994 15:12:18 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!ent-img.com!wb6hqq!bart@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Theory Exams.
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994May17.002236.14869@cnsvox.uwec.edu>,
Mike White <whitemp@hemp> wrote:
>: In article <15MAY199414165893@elroy.uh.edu> st3qi@elroy.uh.edu (Brad
>YES!!! What we need is a Noice..Extra >text< book! The 'Now You're
>Talking' book is pretty good.

An excellent textbook for the theory and practice of radio is:

Electronic Communications by Robert L. Schrader

I didn't discover it until I already had an Advanced but used it to learn the theory and practice required for my second class radiotelephone license. That was nearly 25 years ago but the book has been kept up with at least 2 new editions and I strongly recommend it. I have bought subsequent editions and given them away to ham hopefuls, two of which did get their tickets. It's written as a trade school or junior college textbook and doesn't require a mathematical capability beyond high school algebra. The book is written as a text for both the amateur and commercial radio licenses and has questions at the end of each chapter relevant to the various licensing examinations. The goal of the text is a first class radiotelephone and telegraph license with stopping points along the way for the lower commercial and amateur grades.

For me it set the hook.....

bart wb6hqq

bart@wb6hqq.ent-img.com

Date: Fri, 20 May 1994 13:28:18 GMT
From: brunix!maxcy2.maxcy.brown.edu!md@uunet.uu.net
Subject: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

kevin jessup <kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:

[stuff]

Many good comments. I agree with most of what you said, if not all in principle.

MD

--

-- Michael P. Daignan
-- Amalgamated Baby Seal Poachers Union, Local 101
-- "Get 'The Club'... Endorsed by Baby Seal poachers everywhere..."

Date: Thu, 19 May 1994 19:31:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!gatech!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <hamilton.768924220@BIX.com>, <051694162854Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<2rig76\$5es@hebron.connected.com>
Subject : Re: Code test speeds

dragonsl@hebron.connected.com (Ralph Lindberg) writes:

> If someone else has posted this, sorry my servies news server was down
>and we missed somethings.
> The code requirement for HF transmission cannot be removed, it's in the
>international treatys that control Ham radio. Some counties water it down
>so much that it's hardly there, BUT IT'S STILL THERE.

No, not quite. That has been discussed before. Other countries have opted out of that part of the treaty, notably Japan (Who has 5 or 6 TIMES the number of amateurs that the US has).

Dan N8PKV

--

"No free man shall ever be de-barred the use of arms. The strongest reason for the people to retain their right to keep and bear arms is as a last resort to protect themselves against tyranny in government."

-Thomas Jefferson

Date: 20 May 1994 19:53:02 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!
news.umbc.edu!haven.umd.edu!umd5.umd.edu!mark@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CpyE92.4n7@world.std.com>, <SR0.94May17235139@media-
lab.media.mit.edu>, <RFM.94May18134613@urth.eng.sun.com>

Subject : Re: What *does* the FCC think? (was Re: Code test speeds)

In article <RFM.94May18134613@urth.eng.sun.com>,
Richard McAllister <rfm@urth.eng.sun.com> wrote:

>I do think the emphasis on code is bad, but no longer fatal. As I've talked
>to people (bright, energetic people who'd be contributors) about ham radio,
>I find they lose a lot of interest when they find out they're still walled
>off from a lot of the hobby unless they learn the code.

That's me back in the 70's. I didn't pursue a license because of the code.
Remember that this was a period when you needed pretty fast morse code
in order to transmit NTSC video. *You* tell *me* the connection :)

I recently found out about the no-code license. Now, I'm studying
radio again after forgetting about it for 15 years.

Mark S.

Date: 19 May 94 14:04:05 GMT

From: yale.edu!noc.near.net!news.delphi.com!BIX.com!hamilton@yale.arpa

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1994May18.100515.18323@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <2rdngd\$qvo@nyx10.cs.du.edu>,
<1994May19.102423.2447@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>

Subject : Re: Code test speeds

gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <2rdngd\$qvo@nyx10.cs.du.edu> jmaynard@nyx10.cs.du.edu (Jay Maynard)

writes:

>>The same arguments you give against advance classes of ham license apply
>>equally to advanced college degrees ...

>No, you're still confusing *exit* requirements with entrance requirements.

Err, ah, Gary, ever think about why they graduation ceremonies
commencement exercises? Could it be because the education is
only a _preparation_ for life, not an end-all, be-all?

Regards,

Doug Hamilton KD1UJ hamilton@bix.com Ph 508-358-5715
Hamilton Laboratories, 13 Old Farm Road, Wayland, MA 01778-3117, USA

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #217
